# Cap K Update – CNDI 2014

## Links

### Oil

#### Oil policies and attempts to secure oil have historically been about control and propping up American capitalism.

**North 2003**

(David, the national chairman of the Socialist Equality Party in the United States (SEP), “The crisis of American capitalism and the war against Iraq”, March 21st 2003, <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2013/03/19/iraq-m19.html>, accessed 7/11/13, JK)

3. That the United States is the instigator of this war is beyond question. The principal objective of the war is to seize control of Iraq’s oil resources. All efforts to deny the central role of oil in the American drive to conquer Iraq reek of dishonesty and cynicism. No other natural resources have played such a central role in the political and economic calculations of American imperialism over the last century as oil and natural gas. Involved in this central preoccupation is not only the profits of American-owned oil conglomerates—though this is by no means an insignificant concern. American industry, the stability of America’s financial-monetary structure and its dominant world position are all dependent upon unimpeded access to, and control of, the vast oil resources of the Persian Gulf and, more recently, the Caspian Basin.¶ The history of American foreign policy and military strategy over the last three decades can be studied, from a purely economic standpoint, as a response to the “oil shock” of 1973, when the oil embargo declared by leading Arab oil producers in response to the Arab-Israeli War of that year led to a quadrupling of petroleum prices—a development that staggered the American and world capitalist economy. The second oil shock in the aftermath of the Iranian Revolution in 1979 led to the proclamation of the Carter Doctrine, which declared unimpeded access to the Persian Gulf to be a major strategic concern of the United States. This set the stage for the massive buildup of US military forces that has proceeded without interruption for the last 23 years.¶ The world position of the United States as the principal imperialist power depends not only on preserving its own unimpeded access to oil, but also on its ability to determine how much of this diminishing natural resource is available to other countries—especially to present-day or potential rivals. The approach the United States has taken to this international geo-political aspect of oil as a critical resource has been profoundly affected by the most significant political event of the last quarter of the twentieth century—the dissolution of the USSR.¶ The collapse of the Soviet Union was interpreted by the American ruling elite as an opportunity to implement a sweeping imperialist agenda that had been impossible in the aftermath of World War II and during nearly a half-century of Cold War. Proclaiming the arrival of a “unipolar moment,” the United States set out to prevent, as a principal strategic objective, the emergence of another power—whether a newly-unified Europe, Japan, or, potentially, China—that might challenge its dominant international position. Aware of the significant decline in the position of the United States in the world economy, the strategists of American imperialism came to see its overwhelming military power as the principal means by which the United States could effect a fundamental reordering of the world in its own interests. Within this context, the use of military power to establish effective control of oil producing regions and the worldwide distribution of this essential resource was transformed from a strategic idea into a concrete plan of action.

### Fishing

#### **Fishing or exploiting fish for profit is Capitalistic.**

**Riggins, 11**- (Thomas, Thomas Riggins is a retired city housing manager and currently a university lecturer in philosophy and ancient civilizations in New York City. He is a veteran of the peace and civil rights movements of the 1960s. He holds degrees from Florida State University and the CUNY Graduate Center. He is currently a member of the United Auto Workers and a former Teamster. He has been writing for Political Affairs since 1999 and more recently for People's World, December 7, “Capitalism in a fish bowl”, People’s World, <http://peoplesworld.org/capitalism-in-a-fish-bowl/>, DA)

Capitalism can sometimes be very confusing to figure out, especially with the complex interrelations of the world economy and the different banking laws and corporate structures and all the national forms economies take. It would be helpful if we had a very simple way to look at it and figure it out. A simple model of how this system works that we could extrapolate to the whole system to understand it the better. I propose to discuss what is happening to the fish in the seas and to suggest that their fate under capitalism is just a smaller version of the fate that awaits us all if we allow this economic system to continue to dominate our lives and our planet. My information is taken from Science Daily.¶ As we are well aware, the world's oceans used to teem with sea life, and great flotillas of fishing vessels have scowered the seas to catch this life and bring it to market to feed a hungry world [at least a hungry rich northern world] and to make a profit - especially a profit. If a particular species of fish could bring in a good profit, it would be fished to extinction to obtain that profit rather than be allowed to recover to be fished again some day in the future. It is not a sustainable food supply that capitalism seeks to create, but immediate profits on its investments. This is, by the way, why humane farming laws are difficult to enact and almost impossible to enforce.¶ At any rate, the SD article reports that scientists at the University of British Columbia have published a study that shows since the 1950s large marine predators such as marlins, swordfish, tunas and sharks have declined by 90 percent and have practically been wiped out in the northern Pacific and Atlantic by commercial fishing. These commercial fish, having been hunted to near extinction in the northern hemisphere, are no longer sought in great numbers in the north by the fishing fleets. After sweeping them out of the coastal areas of the northern continents and islands, the fleets scoured the open seas and have now headed to the southern hemisphere where they intend to continue their unsustainable fishing methods to maintain their profits, pillaging the coasts and the open waters of the Indian and South Pacific and Atlantic oceans as well as the Antarctic Ocean. ¶ One of the researchers mentioned in the SD article and lead author of the study, Laura Tremblay-Boyer, was quoted as saying, "Species such as tuna have been seriously exploited because of high market demand. A constant theme throughout of global marine ecosystems is these top predators are today prey for human beings, assisted by some serious technology. Top marine predators are more intrinsically vulnerable to the effects of fishing due to their life histories. Bluefin tuna, for instance, cannot reproduce until age nine." But the demand for fish from the markets of the north has not ceased. And now, the same shortages are beginning to appear in the southern oceans.¶ "After running out of predator fish in the north Atlantic and Pacific," co-author of the study Daniel Pauly said, "rather than implementing strict management and enforcement, the fishing industry pointed its bows south. The southern hemisphere predators are now on the same trajectory as the ones in the northern hemisphere. What happens next when we have nowhere left to turn?"¶ A good question. This is exactly the same behavior we have seen the capitalists engaging in with respect to climate change. Cancun, Copenhagen, and now Durban. No binding agreements - in fact, the major world leaders didn't even bother to show up for the Durban conference - and it is breathable air and temperatures compatible with life that is the issue. What happens next when we have nowhere left to turn?

### Human Rights

#### Human rights rhetoric is just another way to propagate neoliberal hegemony and obscure the inequalities of capitalism

Douzinas, 13, Costas, Professor of Law and Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities at Birkbeck, University of London, 2013, Critical Legal Thinking, “Seven Theses on Human Rights: (3) Neoliberal Capitalism & Voluntary Imperialism” http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/05/23/seven-theses-on-human-rights-3-neoliberal-capitalism-voluntary-imperialism/

Social and political systems become hegemonic by turning their ideological priorities into universal principles and values. In the new world order, human rights are the perfect candidate for this role. Their core principles, interpreted negatively and economically, promote neoliberal capitalist penetration. Under a different construction, their abstract provisions could subject the inequalities and indignities of late capitalism to withering attack. But this cannot happen as long as they are used by the dominant powers to spread the ‘values’ of an ideology based on the nihilism and insatiability of desire.¶ Despite differences in content, colonialism and the human rights movement form a continuum, episodes in the same drama, which started with the great discoveries of the new world and is now carried out in the streets of Iraq and Afghanistan: bringing civilization to the barbarians. The claim to spread Reason and Christianity gave western empires their sense of superiority and their universalizing impetus. The urge is still there; the ideas have been redefined but the belief in the universality of our world-​view remains as strong as that of the colonialists. There is little difference between imposing reason and good governance and proselytizing for Christianity and human rights. They are both part of the cultural package of the West, aggressive and redemptive at the same time.

## Impacts

### War

#### Capitalism drives competition, which creates perpetual wars for profits.

**Revolution**

Socialist Revolution, No Date (Socialist Revolution, http://www.socialistrevolution.org/ideas/capitalism-and-war/is-war-inherant-to-capitalism/)

What are the underlying reasons for the war? Is it just because we have an “oil man” in the White House, or a bunch of power-hungry politicians hell bent on ruling the world? Or is it something more fundamental about how the world is run?¶ As the war on Iraq moves closer and closer, the real reasons behind the war – the US’s attempts to increase its world domination and get its hands on Iraq’s oil – are being revealed to millions around the world.¶ How much clearer can it get? We have been told for the past 8 months that the aim of the US and Britain was to “disarm Iraq” and “destroy Saddam’s weapons of mass destruction”. But not one shred of evidence has been found to support the idea that Saddam has “illegal weapons programmes” or any “weapons of mass destruction”. Nor will it be. The UN resolutions, the weapons inspectors and the record of Saddam’s regime were only smokescreens to hide the real aims of the war.¶ What are the underlying reasons for the war? Is it just because we have an “oil man” in the White House, or a bunch of power-hungry politicians hell bent on ruling the world? Or is it something more fundamental about how the world is run?¶ If it were just because we had bad leaders like Bush and Blair, the solution would be very easy. Let’s kick them out of office and replace them with leaders who won’t wage war. If we were to look only at the last few years of history, that might be a reasonable assumption to make. After all, Blair led the charge to declare war on Serbia in 1998 and was quick to join Bush in waging war on Afghanistan. Both are obviously warmongers.¶ **A permanent feature?**¶ But if we look at the past one hundred years, we’ve seen an unprecedented growth in technology and economic development.¶ At the same time we’ve also seen the biggest ever growth in inequality between rich and poor. We’ve also seen wars become an almost permanent feature of human society. There has not been a war-free decade in the last 100 years. More people died in wars in the 20th century than all the rest of human history put together¶ The system we live under, capitalism, is the root cause of most of the world’s problems, and war is an inherent feature of it.¶ Under capitalism, the resources, the products of the world, and the means to produce them are controlled by a small number of capitalists. The other 5 billion of us are forced to work for this tiny elite either in factories, offices or on the land. In return for this “privilege” we get a wage at the end of the week. For the billions who live outside the rich Western countries, this wage, if you’re lucky enough to have a job, is barely enough to live on.¶ It is a system that runs on competition, and decisions are made on the basis of profit. Different companies all compete for market share. They come up with different products not to meet human needs but so they can carve out a bigger market share and make a bigger profit. Nike competes with Adidas and Reebok to sell us different coloured trainers and track suits. Music companies compete to sell us more bland manufactured music like Gareth Gates, Will Young. Britney Spears or Pink. The music is secondary; all that matters is what can be sold and how much profit can be made.¶ Competition is so important to capitalism that it tries to introduce it in to every part of society. So hospitals compete for patients, universities and schools must compete for students. Public utilities like water companies and train services are privatised and broken up into smaller companies so they can compete for customers.¶ The end result of this is higher bills, a declining standard of services and lower wages for those who work in the industry. It makes us compete for jobs, housing and food even though there is more than enough to go around. It is a system that puts the profits and the interest of the big corporations before the needs and interests of billions of people.¶ **Imperialism**¶ A result of all this competition is that weaker firms either go bankrupt or get taken over by bigger ones. As companies grow (in many cases into monopolies) they not only compete in their own countries but they start to compete with companies all over the world for access to markets, access to cheaper sources of labour and resources like oil. For example not only does Sainsbury compete with Tesco, but both compete with the US supermarket giant Wal-Mart which owns Asda.¶ The end result of this competition on a global scale is that nation states start to compete for the right to exploit the world’s resources and people, and this is what leads to war.¶ In 1916 the Russian revolutionary Lenin described this period, where capital and wealth are concentrated into a few hands leading to competition between a few nation states for the control of the world, as imperialism. It was the attempt to re-divide the world for exploitation between the imperialist powers that caused the First and Second World Wars.¶ Using the theory of imperialism as a guide Lenin illustrated the imperialist nature of the first world war with example of “a slave owner who owned 100 slaves warring against a slave owner who owned 200 slaves for a more ‘just’ distribution of slaves”.¶ **Logic of the world**¶ This has been the logic behind the pattern of wars in the last century. A few rich countries dominate and control the resources of the rest of the world. They no longer do this through having formal colonial empires, like those once possessed by Britain and France, but through the more informal means of chaining entire nations through debt-slavery and swallowing up the economy by the First World’s multinationals.¶ Occasionally, the imperialists quarrel amongst themselves over their share of the loot – leading to wars like the two World Wars of the last century. Occasionally, the slaves rebel against their masters and fight for their independence, leading to wars like Vietnam’s long war against French and US imperialism. And occasionally, the imperialists wage wars of conquest against countries whose leaders don’t know their place or refuse to play their game – like the first Gulf War or in Nicaragua.¶ The reason countries like China, France and Germany seem opposed to the war on Iraq, is not because they want peace, but because they’re in competition with the US and don’t want to see the US in control of the Middle East.¶

### Inequality

#### Capitalist inequality is the root cause of structural violence

Chana, 10, Tejwant K., 2010, PhD Candidate, Instructor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta (Edmonton, Alberta) “Neoliberal Globalization and ‘Global Education’ in Urban Secondary Schools in India: Colonial Reproductions or Anti-Colonial Possibilities?” Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences (2010) Vol 2, Special Issue No 1,151-191

#### It has been argued by some scholars that global ¶ economic integration has observed many positive features ¶ within a relatively short period of time. For example, life ¶ expectancy, literacy rates, food security, and GDP (gross ¶ domestic product) rates have all increased, whilst poverty ¶ rates and population growth have declined (see for example, ¶ Bhagwati, 2004; Norberg, 2003; Wolf, 2004). However, ¶ according to others (including some institutions that ¶ champion the process), the gap between the rich and the poor, both between and within nations, has widened (Arrighi, ¶ 2005; Peet and Hartwick, 2009; UNDP, 2008; World Bank, 2006). Many negative impacts of globalization on the ¶ majority of the world’s peoples extend beyond impacts and ¶ changes in the economic realm (production, consumption, ¶ and investment) but also include the political, cultural, and ¶ environmental realms (Spring, 2009; Toh, 2004). This ¶ worldwide governance and organization based on the ¶ historical and asymmetrical juxtaposing of “core and ¶ periphery,” “North and South,” “colonizer and colonized,” ¶ “First World and Third World,” “West and Rest,” and/or ¶ “developed and developing” divide is the root cause of ¶ structural violence (i.e., poverty, forced slavery, warfare, ¶ cultural annihilation, displacement, exploitation) particularly ¶ in the “developing” world, (Bales, 1999; Toh, 2004), despite ¶ the promises and projections of political peace and economic ¶ prosperity made by Western financial leaders at Bretton ¶ Woods post-colonization to the present (Bello, 2002; Foster, ¶ 2006; Harvey, 2003; Held and McGrew, 2007; Peet and ¶ Hartwick, 2009).

#### Capitalism unsustainable, root cause of inequality

Muller, 13 (Jerry Z., 2013, Professor of History at the Catholic University of America and author of multiple books about capitalism, “Capitalism and Inequality,” Foreign Affairs, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138844/jerry-z-muller/capitalism-and-inequality>, accessed June 28, 2014, TKH)

Inequality is indeed increasing almost everywhere in the postindustrial capitalist world. But despite what many on the left think, this is not the result of politics, nor is politics likely to reverse it, for the problem is more deeply rooted and intractable than generally recognized. Inequality is an inevitable product of capitalist activity, and expanding equality of opportunity only increases it -- because some individuals and communities are simply better able than others to exploit the opportunities for development and advancement that capitalism affords. Despite what many on the right think, however, this is a problem for everybody, not just those who are doing poorly or those who are ideologically committed to egalitarianism -- because if left unaddressed, rising inequality and economic insecurity can erode social order and generate a populist backlash against the capitalist system at large.

### Sexism

#### Capitalism is the root cause of the oppression of women

WSD, Workers Solidarity Movement, ’10

(2-03-10, Toward Women’s Freedom, <http://www.wsm.ie/c/womens-freedom-feminism-anarchism-wsm?page=9>, accessed 6/27/14, AGS)

We recognise that women are specially oppressed as a sex, that they face oppression as women as well as due to their class position. We call this oppression sexism. As anarchists we oppose sexism wherever it exists on principle and in practice.¶ 2.1 The questions of whether women have always been oppressed in some form or not and how the oppression of women as a sex first began are still unanswered and, ultimately, impossible to verify. It's generally accepted that in hunter/gatherer societies the status of women was relatively high and that women's social position deteriorated with the development of class society. It is not necessary, however, to prove, that in some past era women enjoyed equal status to that of men in order to believe that in the future women can live as equals to men.¶ 2.2 The nature of women's oppression has changed as societies have developed. For example, the oppression of women that might have existed in some pre-class societies assumed a fundamentally new character with the development of class society. Just as the oppression of women in feudal societies changed its character with the development of capitalism. Where women's oppression has existed in different societies it has always had a material basis.¶ 2.3 We reject the idea that women are in any way inferior to men or that women are biologically predisposed to assume certain roles in society. Likewise we believe that men are not inherently sexist . Sexism, racism etc are not genetic traits but, rather, are formed by social existence, upbringing and education.¶ **Class, sex and capitalism**¶3.1.There are fundamental differences between class exploitation and the oppression of women as a sex. Capitalism depends for its survival on the exploitation and oppression of one class by the other. As anarchists we aim to abolish class society and eliminate all classes. Sexist oppression, on the other hand, is not based on an inherently antagonistic relationship between men and women. We fight for a society where women and men can live freely and equally together.¶ 3.2. The experience of sexism is differentiated by class. Wealthy women have always been able to use their wealth to mitigate their oppression; so for example, a struggle for Free Abortion on Demand will not gain the same support from a woman who could always afford one anyway as it will from a working class woman. Conversely, it is working women who face the brunt of women's oppression.¶ 3.3 While capitalism is dependent on class exploitation, it can to a large extent accommodate similar treatment of men and women within a capitalist framework. For example, despite the temporary nature of some of the gains women have made over the last, say, 100 years, there has been a general progression in many countries. The situation of women in most first world societies and the underlying assumptions in society of what roles are natural and right for women have changed radically.¶ 3.4. Nevertheless, sexist oppression will never completely disappear in capitalist society. This is because women, due to their potential to get pregnant, will always be more vulnerable than men in a society which is based on the need to maximise profit.¶ ¶ Under capitalism, the fact that women get pregnant makes them ultimately responsible for any child they bear. In consequence, paid maternity leave, leave to care for sick children, free crèche and childcare facilities etc, in short everything that would be necessary to ensure the economic equality of women under capitalism, will always be especially relevant to women. Because of this, women are generally less economical than men to employ and more vulnerable to attacks on gains such as crèche facilities etc.¶ Women will not be free until they have full control of their own bodies. Yet under capitalism, abortion rights are never guaranteed. Even if gains are made in this area they can be attacked (as can be seen, for example, in the rise and fall of abortion rights in the USA).¶ Thus, the oppression of women under capitalism has an economic and sexual basis, which are inter-related.¶ These are the root causes of women's oppression from which stem other forms of oppression like, for example, the ideological oppression of women.¶ 3.5. Women's oppression is in the direct interests of capitalism and the State.¶ When women work outside the home they are paid less and receive less benefits than men, thus providing a cheap pool of labour. When women work at home (in either a full-time or part-time capacity) they are not paid at all and in fact the work they do is rarely considered work. This leads to a devaluation of the work women do in society.¶ The family is the most economic unit of reproduction and maintenance of the workforce. (It must be emphasised that "family values" have more to do with profit than with morality.) Women's unpaid work in the household supplies the bosses with the next generation of workers at no extra cost, as women are doing the cooking, cleaning and child rearing for free. They also take care of the sick and the elderly in the same way. Most working-class women in Ireland today do the housework as well as join the workforce. In this way, they work a "double shift" at great personal cost.¶ Capitalism thrives off hierarchies and divisions within the working class. Women's oppression and the sexist ideas that try to "justify" it divide the working class. By promoting divisions between men and women, the bosses and rulers weaken workers organisation and resistance. This increases the power of the ruling class.¶ **Women's Liberation through working class revolution**¶4.1 Given that capitalism and the State are the key sources of women's oppression, real freedom for women requires a revolution against these structures of oppression.¶ 4.2 Since women in the ruling class benefit from capitalism and the State, and from the super-exploitation of working class women that these structures utilise, they are incapable of challenging the root source of women's oppression. There for we do not call for an alliance of "all women" against sexism, we realise that, some women (the ruling class women) have an objective interest in the preservation of the structures that cause sexism (capitalism and the State).¶ 4.3

## Race Neg

### 1NC Link

#### Race and class are dialectically conjoined in the reproduction of capitalist relations – capitalism created the racialized subject to entrench competition and destroy universal class consciousness, sustaining racism as a method of papering over the internal contradictions of capital. This process suppresses labor to maintain the system of capital accumulation.

**San Juan 3** (Fulbright Lecturer @ Univ. of Leuven, Belgium) [E., “Marxism and the Race/Class Problematic: A Re-Articulation”, <http://clogic.eserver.org/2003/sanjuan.html> ]

It seems obvious that racism cannot be dissolved by instances of status mobility when sociohistorical circumstances change gradually or are transformed by unforeseen interventions. The black bourgeoisie continues to be harassed and stigmatized by liberal or multiculturalist practices of racism, not because they drive Porsches or conspicuously flaunt all the indices of wealth. Class exploitation cannot replace or stand for racism because it is the condition of possibility for it. It is what enables the racializing of selected markers, whether physiological or cultural, to maintain, deepen and reinforce alienation, mystifying reality by modes of commodification, fetishism, and reification characterizing the routine of quotidian life. Race and class are dialectically conjoined in the reproduction of capitalist relations of exploitation and domination.¶ 30. **We might take a passage from Marx as a source of guidelines for developing a historical-materialist theory of racism which is not empiricist but dialectical** in aiming for theorizing conceptual concreteness as a multiplicity of historically informed and configured determinations. This passage comes from a letter dated 9 April 1870 to Meyer and Vogt in which Marx explains why the Irish struggle for autonomy was of crucial significance for the British proletariat:¶ . . . Every industrial and commercial center in England possesses a working class divided into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the ruling nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists of his country against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of the 'poor whites' to the 'niggers' in the former slave states of the USA. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker at once the accomplice and stupid tool of the English rule in Ireland.¶ This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. This antagonism is the secret of the impotence of the English working class, despite its organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power. And that class is fully aware of it (quoted in Callinicos 1993).¶ Here **Marx sketches three parameters for the sustained viability of racism in modern capitalist society. First, the economic competition among workers is dictated by the distribution of labor power** in the labor-market via differential wage rates. **The distinction between skilled and unskilled labor is contextualized in differing national origins, languages and traditions of workers, which can be manipulated into racial antagonisms. Second, the appeal of racist ideology to white workers**, with their identification as members of the "ruling nation" affording--in W.E.B. DuBois's words--"public and psychological wage" or compensation. **Like religion, white-supremacist nationalism provides the illusory resolution to the real contradictions of life for the working majority of citizens. Third, the ruling class reinforces and maintains these racial divisions for the sake of capital accumulation** within the framework of its ideological/political hegemony in the metropolis and worldwide.¶ 31. **Racism and nationalism are thus modalities in which class struggles articulate themselves at strategic points in history.** No doubt social conflicts in recent times have involved not only classes but also national, ethnic, and religious groups, as well as feminist, ecological, antinuclear social movements (Bottomore 1983). **The concept of "internal colonialism"** (popular in the seventies) t**hat subjugates national minorities, as well as the principle of self-determination for oppressed or "submerged" nations** espoused by Lenin, **exemplify dialectical attempts to historicize the collective agency for socialist transformation**. Within the framework of the global division of labor between metropolitan center and colonized periphery, a Marxist program of national liberation is meant to take into account the extraction of surplus value from colonized peoples through unequal exchange as well as through direct colonial exploitation in "Free Trade Zones," illegal traffic in prostitution, mail-order brides, and contractual domestics (at present, the Philippines provides the bulk of the latter, about ten million persons and growing). **National oppression has a concrete reality not entirely reducible to class exploitation but incomprehensible apart from it; that is, it cannot be adequately understood without the domination of the racialized peoples in the dependent formations by the colonizing/imperialist power**, with the imperial nation-state acting as the exploiting class, as it were (see San Juan 1998; 2002).32. Racism arose with the creation and expansion of the capitalist world economy(Wolf 1982; Balibar and Wallerstein, 1991). **Solidarities conceived as racial or ethnic groups acquire meaning and value in terms of their place within the social organization of production and reproduction of the ideological-political order; ideologies of racism** as collective social evaluation of solidarities **arise to reinforce structural constraints which preserve the exploited and oppressed position of these "racial" solidarities**. Such patterns of economic and political segmentation mutate in response to the impact of changing economic and political relationships (Geshwender and Levine 1994). Overall, **there is no denying the fact that national-liberation movements and indigenous groups fighting for sovereignty,** together with heterogeneous alliances and coalitions, **cannot be fully understood without a critical analysis of the production of surplus value and its expropriation by the propertied class--that is, capital accumulation**. As John Rex noted,¶ different ethnic groups are placed in relations of cooperation, symbiosis or conflict by the fact that as groups they have different economic and political functions.Within this changing class order of [colonial societies], the language of racial difference frequently becomes the means whereby men allocate each other to different social and economic positions. What the type of analysis used here suggests is that the exploitation of clearly marked groups in a variety of different ways is integral to capitalism and that ethnic groups unite and act together because they have been subjected to distinct and differentiated types of exploitation. Race relations and racial conflict are necessarily structured by political and economic factors of a more generalized sort (1983, 403-05, 407).¶ **Hence** race relations and race conflict are necessarily structured by the larger totality of the political economy **of a given society**, **as well as by modifications in the structure of the world economy. Corporate profit-making via class exploitation on an international/globalized scale, at bottom, still remains the logic of the world system of finance capitalism based on historically changing structures and retooled practices of domination and subordination.**

### Link – Race

#### Viewing emancipation through a racial prism distorts the actual structure of power and privilege and creates tensions between different oppressed groups who in actuality the same class interests.

Manning Marable, University of Colorado, 1995 Beyond Black and White: Transforming African American Politics

But the problem with the prism of race is that it simultaneously clarifies and distorts social reality It both illuminates and obscures, creating false dichotomies and distinctions between people where none really exists. The constructive identity of race, the conceptual framework which the oppressed create to interpret their experiences of inequality and discrimination, often clouds the concrete reality of class, and blurs the actual structure of power and privilege. It creates tensions between oppressed groups which share common class interests, but which may have different physical appearances or colors. For example, on the recent debates concerning undocumented immigrants, a narrow racial perspective could convince African-Americans that they should be opposed to the civil rights and employment opportunities of Mexican Americans, Central Americans and other Latino people. We could see Latinos as potential competitors in the labor market rather than as allies in a struggle against corporate capital and conservatives within the political establishment. On affirmative action, a strict racist outlook might view the interests of lower-class and working-class whites as directly conflicting with programs which could increase opportunities for blacks and other people of color. The racial prism creates an illusion that "race" is permanent and finite; but, in reality, "race" is a complex expression of unequal relations which are dynamic and ever-changing. The dialectics of racial thinking pushes black people toward the logic of "us" versus "them," rather than a formulation which cuts across the perceived boundaries of color. This observation is not a criticism of the world-views of my father, my children, or myself as I grew up in Dayton, Ohio. It is only common sense that most African-Americans perceive and interpret the basic struggle for equality and empowerment in distinctly racial terms. This perspective does speak to our experiences and social reality, but only to a portion of what that reality truly is. The parallel universes of race do not stand still. What was "black" and "white" in Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee of 1895 was not identical to categories of color and race in New Orleans a century ago; both are distinctly different from how we perceive and define race in the USA a generation after legal segregation. There is always a distance between our consciousness and the movement of social forces, between perception and historical reality. "Blackness" must inevitably be redefined in material terms and ideologically, as millions of black and Hispanic people from the Caribbean, Africa and Latin America immigrate into the USA, assimilating within hundreds of urban centers and thousands of neighborhoods with other people of color. As languages, religions, cultural traditions and kinship networks among blacks in the USA become increasingly diverse and complex, our consciousness and our ideas of historical struggle against the leviathan of race also shift and move in new directions. This does not mean that "race" has declined in significance; it does mean that what we mean by "race" and how "race" is utilized as a means of dividing the oppressed are once again being transformed in many crucial respects.

### Link – Non-Materialism

#### **The aff’s subjective ideological focus on immaterial and textual methodologies trades off with resistance to material structures – representational theories override historical and material theories to mask capitalism’s dominance.**

Zavarzadeh **94** Mas’ud, Dept English @ Syracuse, “The Stupidity that Consumption is Just as Productive as Production,” The Alternative Orange, V 4, Fall/Winter, http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/4/v4nl\_cpp.html

The task of this text [1] is to lay bare the structure of assumptions and its relation to the workings of the regime of capital and wage-labor (what I have articulated as “post-al logic”), [2] that unites all these seemingly different text as they recirculate some of the most reactionary practices that are now masquerading as “progressive” in the postmodern academy. Analyzing the post-al logic of the left is important because it not only reveals how the ludic left is complicit with capitalism but, for the more immediate purposes of this text-of-response, it allows us to relate the local discussions in these text to global problems and to deal, in OR – 2’s words, with the “encompassing philosophical issues” [3] that are so violently suppressed y the diversionist uses of “detailism” [4] in these nine text. Whether they regard themselves to be “new new left,” “feminist,” “neo-Marxist,” or “anarchist,” these texts—in slightly different local idioms—do the ideological work of US capitalism by producing theories, pedagogies, arguments, ironies, anecdotes, turns of phrases and jokes that obscure the laws of motion of capital. Post-al logic is marked above all by its erasure of “production” as the determining force in organizing human societies and their institutions, and its insistence on “consumption” and “distribution” as the driving force of the social. The argument of the post-al left (briefly) is that “labor,” in advanced industrial “democracies,” is superseded by “information,” and consequently “knowledge” (not class struggle over the rate of surplus labor) has become the driving force of history. The task of the post-al left is to deconstruct the “metaphysics of labor” and consequently to announce the end of socialism and with it the “outdatedness” of the praxis of abolishing private property (that is, congealed alienated labor) in the post-al moment. Instead of abolishing private property, an enlightened radical democracy—which is to supplant socialism (as Laclau, Mouffe, Aronowitz, Butler and others have advised)—should make property holders of each citizen. The post-al left rejects the global objective conditions of production of the local subjective circumstances of consumption, and its master trope is what R-4 so clearly foregrounds: the (shopping) “mall”—the ultimate site of consumption “with all the latest high-tech textwares” deployed to pleasure the “body.” In fact, the post-al left has “invented” a whole new interdiscipline called “cultural studies” that provides the new alibi for the regime of profit by shifting social analytics for “production” to “consumption.” (On the political economy of “invention” in ludic theory, see Transformation 2 on “The Invention of the Queer.”) To prove its “progressiveness,” the post-al left devotes most of its energies (see the writings of John Fiske, Constance Penley, Michael Berube, [Henry/Robert] Louis Gates, Jr., Andrew Ross, Susan Willis, Stuart Hall, Fredric Jameson), to demonstrate how “consumption” is in fact an act of production and resistance to capitalism and a practice in which a utopian vision for a society of equality is performed! The shift from “production” to “consumption” manifests itself in post-al left theories through the focus on “superstructural” cultural analysis and the preoccupation not with the “political economy” (“base”) but with “representation”—for instance, of race, sexuality, environment, ethnicity, nationality and identity. This is, for example, one reason for R-2’s ridiculing the “base” and “superstructure” analytical model of classical Marxism (Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy) with an anecdote (the privileged mode of “argument” for the post-al left) that the base is really not all that “basic” To adhere to the base/superstructure model for him/her is to be thrown into an “epistemological gulag.” For the post-al left a good society is, therefore, one in which, as R-4 puts it, class antagonism is bracketed and the “surplus value” is distributed more evenly among men and women, whites and persons of color, the lesbian and the straight. It is not a society in which “surplus value”—the exploitative appropriation of the other’s labor—is itself eliminated by revolutionary praxis. The post-al left’s good society is not one in which private ownership is obsolete and the social division of labor (class) is abolished, rather it is a society in which the fruit of exploitation of the proletariat (surplus labor) is more evenly distributed and a near-equality of consumption is established. This distributionist/consumptionist theory that underwrites the economic interests of the (upper)middle classes is the foundation for all the texts in this exchange and their pedagogies. A good pedagogy, in these text, therefore is one in which power is distributed evenly in the classroom: a pedagogy that constructs a classroom of consensus not antagonism (thus opposition to “politicizing the classroom” in OR-1) and in which knowledge (concept) is turned into—through the process that OR-3 calls “translation”—into “consumable” EXPERIENCES. The more “intense” the experience, as the anecdotes of OR-3 show, the more successful the pedagogy In short, it is a pedagogy that removes the student from his/her position in the social relations of production and places him/her in the personal relation of consumption: specifically, EXPERIENCE of/as the consumption of pleasure. The post-al logic obscures the laws of motion of capital by very specific assumptions and moves—many of which are rehearsed in the texts here, I will discuss some of these, mention others in passing, and hint at several more. (I have provided a full account of all of these moves in my “Post-ality” in Transformation 1.) I begin by outlining the post-al assumptions that “democracy” is a never-ending, open “dialogue” and “conversation” among multicultural citizen; that the source of social inequities is “power”; that a post-class hegemonic “conversation” among multicultural citizens; that truth (as R-2 writes) is an “epistemological gulag”—a construct of power—and thus any form of “ideology critique” that raises questions of “falsehood” and “truth” (“false consciousness”) does so through a violent exclusion of the “other” truths by, in OR-5 words, “staking sole legitimate claim” to the truth in question. Given the injunction of the pist-al logica against binaries (truth/falsehood) the project of “epistemology” is displaced in the ludic academy by “rhetoric.” The question, consequently, becomes not so much what is the “truth” of a practice but whether it “works” (Rhetoric has always served as an alibi for pragmatism.) Therefore, R-4 is not interested in whether my practizes are truthful but in what effects they might have: if College Literature publishes my texts would such an act (regardless of the “truth” of my texts) end up “cutting our funding?” he/she asks. A post-al leftist like R-4, in short, “resists” the state only in so far as the state does not cut his/her “funding.” Similarly, it is enough for a cynical pragmatist like OR-5 to conclude that my argument “has little prospect of effectual force” in order to disregard its truthfulness. The post-al dismantling of “epistemology” and the erasure of the question of “truth,” it must be pointed out, is undertaken to protect the economic interests of the ruling class. If the “truth question” is made to seem outdated and an example of an orthodox binarism (R-2), any conclusions about the truth of ruling class practices are excluded from the scene of social contestation as a violent logocentric (positivistic) totalization that disregards the “difference” of the ruling class. This is why a defender of the ruling class such as R-2 sees an ideology critique aimed at unveiling false consciousness and the production of class consciousness as a form of “epistemological spanking.” It is this structure of assumptions that enables R-4 to answer my question, “What is wrong with being dogmatic?” not in terms of its truth but by reference to its pragmatics (rhetoric): what is “wrong” with dogmatism, she/he says is that it is violent rhetoric (“textual Chernobyl”) and thus Stalinist. If I ask what is wrong with Stalinism, again (in terms of the logic of his/her text) I will not get a political or philosophical argument but a tropological description.[5] The post-al left is a New Age Left: the “new new left” privileged by R-2 and OR‐5—the laid-back, “sensitive," listening, and dialogic left of coalitions, voluntary work, and neighborhood activism (more on these later). It is, as I will show, anti-intellectual and populist; its theory is “bite size” (mystifying, of course, who determines the “size” of the “bite"), and its model of social change is anti-conceptual “spontaneity”: May 68, the fall of the Berlin Wall and, in R-2's text, Chiapas. In the classroom, the New Age post-al pedagogy inhibits any critique of the truth of a student's statement and instead offers, as OR‐3 makes clear, “counseling” feelings by anecdotes. The rejection of “truth” (as “epistemological gulag"—R-2), is accompanied by the rejection of what the post-al left calls “economism." Furthermore, the post-al logic relativizes subjectivities, critiques functionalist explanation, opposes “determinism," and instead of closural readings, offers supplementary ones. It also celebrates eclecticism; puts great emphasis on the social as discourse and on discourse as always inexhaustible by any single interpretation—discourse (the social) always “outruns” and “exceeds” its explanation. Post-al logic is, in fact, opposed to any form of “explanation” and in favor of mimetic description: it regards “explanation” to be the intrusion of a violent outside and “description” to be a respectful, care-ing attention to the immanent laws of signification (inside). This notion of description—which has by now become a new dogma in ludic feminist theory under the concept of “mimesis” (D. Cornell, Beyond Accommodation)—regards politics to be always immanent to practices: thus the banalities about not politicizing the classroom in OR‐1's “anarchist” response to my text[6] and the repeated opposition to binaries in all these nines texts. The opposition to binaries is, in fact, an ideological alibi for erasing class struggle, as is quite clear in R-4's rejection of the model of a society "divided by two antagonistic classes".[7] All these nine texts are part of a much [larger /longer] monolithic ideological lesson through which socially produced differences (class) are dispersed and naturalized (in terms of various modes of identity politics) and deployed to justify practices that are aimed at maintaining a high rate of profit for owners of the means of production. The reason R-4 can say that these writers are not part of a “monolithic ideology” and imply that their diversity indicates their individual freedom and the independence of their insights is because the ideology lesson in each of these texts focuses on a different element of this post-al logic. R-4, her/himself, for example, who was “initially” somewhat “sympathetic” to my “Pedagogy of Pleasure-2," now has second thoughts about that text and in fact joins the rest of the writers to make explicit in his/her text their latent assumptions that I am, after all a Stalinist. [8] The fact that it took her/him six months or so to reach the same conclusion as the others, who had rejected my essay earlier, does not mean that she/he is different from them. All it means is that the detour of mediations in her/his case were of a different temporality. This difference in temporalities of subjectivities is the main ground in bourgeois pedagogy for locating the subject as a sovereign subject of “imagination," that is, as an “independent” person who is capable of pursuing surprising “pleasures” through which she/he can fracture ideology ("the monolithic"). The “New New Left” (as practiced, for example, in what OR‐5 calls the “magisterial” texts of Aronowitz) post-alizes bourgeois democracy (the political ideology of capitalism) by intensifying its pluralism (e.g. multiculturalism) and renaming it “radical democracy”. Radical democracy is the space of dialogue and conversation: no particular view is valorized and no specific conclusions are drawn from these conversations. Conversation is conducted for its own political good: it keeps citizens alert and vigilant. Any intervention in this conversation, from its “outside” (for example Leninist democratic centralism) is seen as shutting out the “other” and thus as an instance of anti-democratic violence. Any conclusion is regarded as imposing one's own view on the “other." In a pedagogy founded upon such assumptions, all theories are of equal validity. The student who puts forth a reactionary religious interpretation is thus placed in the same analytical terrain as the one who offers a scientific explanation because it is “obvious” in this post-al classroom of “difference” that “religion” and “science” are simply two autonomous and incommensurable interpretations whose differences, in the absence of a norm (truth) cannot be adjudicated: they are cases of “differends." It is in this classroom of difference-as-dialogue that Gerald Graff and Gregory Jay say that “if a student ends up deciding” that for him/her “authentic liberation means joining a corporation and making a lot of money," he/she should be respected for his/her views since there is no norm against which one can critique them ("Some Questions about Critical Pedagogy” in Democratic Culture, Fall 1993). But there is a norm—collectivity—and in reference to such a norm, what Graff and Jay regard to be a “personal choice," should be explained and critiqued as the work of dominant ideology and its counter-revolutionary understandings and practices made clear to the students. In contrast to the post-al left classroom in which capitalism, religion, communism are all treated simply as “different” and incommensurable discourses, the pedagogy of critique argues for the priority of science (conceptual knowing) and demonstrates that religion is a mode of mystification through which the ruling class naturalizes its oppression of the proletariat and that what is often regarded to be a “personal choice” is, in fact, a choice made for the subject by the laws of motion of capital. Pedagogy of critique, in other words, argues for the “truth” that mystification (religion) has no place in education and that education is a project of enlightenment and critique of ideology. Such a critique of religion is seen by a post-al leftist as an instance of dogmatism (Stalinism) and such a term as “ruling class” will never be used in his/her classroom since it is rhetorically not effective (Chernobyl!). In valorizing “dialogue” as the spirit of democracy, the post-al left effectively excludes the “critique” (of ideology) from the scene of democratic participation since post-al discourses regard the conclusions critique makes as forcing “closure" on open democratic conversations. Such a move is aimed at discrediting intervention from the “outside” (revolution) as an instance of violence; it legitimates social change as the incremental, consensual reform from inside the system. Accepting dialogics as the means for social change is the condition for being included in the (post-al) democratic community. Dialogue has become a “compulsory” practice, and she/he who refuses to comply and instead offers “critique," loses his/her right to be a member of the community. OR‐5 is clear on this point: “one must negotiate," and since I do not “negotiate," in her/his post-al terms, I am therefore a “demagogue." In my refusal of dialogics, in R-4's words, I “cross the line” from democratic discourse to “dogmatics” (Stalinism), and when R-3 says my pedagogy “pisses” students off because the “interlocutor really is absent” from my text, she/he is referring to my displacement of “dialogue” by “critique”. For a New Age Leftist such as R-2, “dialogue” is imperative because “critique” is as lacking in pleasure as “radical bible studies." OR‐5 marks this absence of jouissance in my critique by calling it “wooden." Even worse, critique, to go back to R-2, is the boring “display-the-truth” business. In post-al left theory, the space of dialogue is the “reality zone” of democracy, and a non-dialogic person in bourgeois democracy is such a grotesque mutation of normal citizenship that he/she becomes either comical (OR‐5 sees my “Pedagogy of Pleasure” as a suitable episode in David Lodge's novels, and OR‐2 sees it as a “hoax” since no normal person will compose such a nondialogical text) or an embodiment of violence (Stalinism). The violent and the comical, however, are often combined in excluding critique since the violence ascribed to the nondialogical is perceived as so intense as to be comical (incommensurate with the reality zone). Thus OR‐3's cartoon combines the violent and/as the comical. The cartoon is, of course, the supreme “art form” of the petty bourgeois in his/her ridicule of the “egghead” who constantly critiques dialogics as both a ruse for producing false consciousness and a means for occluding class consciousness. The cartoon is one of the most commodified texts through which the ruling class teaches the petty bourgeois how to think and feel; how to construct norms of happiness and be cynical. Respect for dialogue, however, is a mere formality in the post-al left: all who advocate it do so cynically (with an enlightened false consciousness which is the mark of subtlety and nuanced understanding). OR‐3, who “translates” the anti-intellectual petulance of the petty bourgeois into a cartoon and advocates openness to difference, says that her/his class was planned as a democratic dialogue (the airing of conflicts), even before “I had met the students” (in other words: dialogue is good transhistorically, always, under all conditions, for all “different” people). R-1 and R-3 both advocate dialogue, even though they know ahead of time that they are not going to “agree” with or “buy” the ideas of their interlocutors; they just want to have the pleasure of, what I called in my “Pedagogy of Pleasure-2," the performance of “talking”. Dialogue is, in all these texts, a device in the pedagogy of pleasure to let students “talk” about their experiences and to protect “experience” as the foundation of subjectivity from the “outside” (critique). The effect of this resistance to “critique” and embracing of “dialogue” (talk) finally makes OR‐3's text collapse into an extended anecdote that effectively erases all conceptual knowledge from the classroom. He/she does not have an “explanation” but merely associated anecdotes. This is also what the cartoon does: it mocks out of existence all modes of conceptuality ("eggheadedness") and thus clears the grounds of social life for experiential indoctrination; the laughter of the cartoon (its “pleasure") is the result of blurring the lines of antagonism between classes; a relaxation of (escape from) the social contradictions that mar the everyday of the petty bourgeois. The blocking of critique from an “outside” then becomes the primary goal of post-al left theory. For ludic philosophers, such as Derrida (e.g. Of Grammatology, 30-65) the “outside” (as opposition to inside) is depicted as an instance of logocentric will: a violent construct that is produced by imposing closure on the “inside." All outsiders, in short, are part of the same chain of signification and thus integral to the inside. Laclau elaborates on this notion and turns it into a “principle” in ludic political theory: all outsides, are, according to him a “constitutive outside” (e.g. New Reflections on Revolution of Our Time, 17-84). Echoing Fredric Jameson—who in his more recent post-al writings, argues that although the “outside” existed in modernity, it has vanished in the post-al moment (e.g. Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism 45-54)—OR‐5 announces that there is no “outside” from which a critique of the ludic academy can be made: everything according to him/her (echoing a neo-marxist cliché) is “ideology." R-2 rehearses the ludic dogma (the “constitutive outside") in order to block the possibility of regarding “inside” and the “outside” as two antagonistic zones, and by repeating this ludic dogma, she/he seems to think that by playing with the word, “outside," she/he has answered my critique of “outside” readers. Given the fetish of dialogics in bourgeois democracy and its relentless opposition to critique (as Stalinism), it is therefore necessary to explain, however briefly, what is the ground of a revolutionary “critique." Revolutionary critique is grounded in what I described, in my “Reading my Readers," as an unsurpassable objectivity—an objectivity that (contrary to poststructuralist theory) is not open to interpretation and that constitutes an ineradicable opposition ("outside"). Objectivity is an “outside” that cannot be included without the system itself being transformed by such inclusion. Since the notion of an unsurpassable objectivity is made unintelligible by post-al rhetoricians, such as Derrida, deMan and Jean Luc Nancy, who have commodified “interpretationism," I need to explain what I mean by the “objective” outside as the foundation of revolutionary praxis and of critique as part of such a praxis. The unsurpassable objectivity which is not open to rhetorical interpretation and constitutes the decided foundation of critique is the "outside" that Marx cans the "Working Day" (Capital 1,340-416). (R-4 willfully misrecognizes my notion of objectivity by confusing my discussion of identity politics and objectivity.) The working day is not what it seems: its reality, like the reality of all capitalist practices, is an alienated reality-there is a contradiction between its appearance and its essence. It "appears" as if the worker, during the working day, receives wages which are equal compensation for his labor. This mystification originates in the fact that the capitalist pays not for "labor" but for "labor power": when labor power is put to use it produces more than it is paid for. The "working day" is the site of the unfolding of this fundamental contradiction: it is a divided day; divided into "necessary labor"-the part in which the worker produces value equivalent to his wages—and the "other," the part of surplus labor"—a part in which the worker works for free and produces "surplus value," The second part of the working day is the source of profit and accumulation of capital. "Surplus labor" is the OBJECTIVE FACT of capitalist relations of production: without "surplus labor" there will be no profit, and without profit there will be no accumulation of capital and without accumulation of capital there will be no capitalism. The goal of bourgeois economics is to conceal this part of the working day, and it should therefore be no surprise that, as a protector of ruling class interests in the academy. R-2, with a studied casualness, places "surplus value" in the adjacency of "radical bible-studies" and quietly turns it into a rather boring matter of interest perhaps only to the dogmatic. To be more concise: "surplus labor" is that objective, unsurpassable "outside" that cannot be made part of the economies of the "inside" without capitalism itself being transformed into socialism. Revolutionary critique is grounded in this truth—objectivity—since all social institutions and practices of capitalism are founded upon the objectivity of surplus labor. The role of a revolutionary pedagogy of critique is to produce class consciousness so as to assist in organizing people into a new vanguard party that aims at abolishing this FACT of the capitalist system and transforming capitalism into a communist society. As I have argued in my "Post-ality" [Transformation 1], (post)structuralist theory, through the concept of "representation," makes all such facts an effect of interpretation and turns them into "undecidable" processes. The boom in ludic theory and Rhetoric Studies in the bourgeois academy is caused by the service it renders the ruling class: it makes the OBJECTIVE reality of the extraction of surplus labor a subjective one-not a decided fact but a matter of "interpretation". In doing so, it "deconstructs" (see the writings of such bourgeois readers as Gayatri Spivak, ComeJl West, and Donna Haraway) the labor theory of value, displaces production with consumption, and resituates the citizen from the revolutionary cell to the ludic shopping mall of R-4. Now that I have indicated the objective grounds of "critique," I want to go back to the erasure of critique by dialogue in the post-al left and examine the reasons why these nine texts locate my critique-al writings and pedagogy in the space of violence, Stalinism and demagoguery. Violence, in the post-al left, is a refusal to "talk", "To whom is Zavarzadeh speaking?" asks OR - 5, who regards my practices to be demagogical, and R-3, finds as a mark of violence in my texts that "The interlocutor really is absent" from them. What is obscured in this representation of the non-dialogical is, of course, the violence of the dialogical. I leave aside here the violence with which these advocates of non-violent conversations attack me in their texts and cartoon. My concern is with the practices by which the post-al left, through dialogue, naturalizes (and eroticizes) the violence that keeps capitalist democracy in power. What is violent? Subjecting people to the daily terrorism of layoffs in order to maintain high rates of profit for the owners of the means of production or redirecting this violence (which gives annual bonuses, in addition to multi-million dollar salaries, benefits and stock options, to the CEOs of the very corporations that are laying off thousands of workers) against the ruling class in order to end class societies? What is violent? Keeping millions of people in poverty, hunger, starvation, homelessness, and deprived of basic health care, at a time when the forces of production have reached a level that can, in fact, provide for the needs of all people, or trying to over throw this system? What is violent? Placing in office, under the alibi of "free elections," post-fascists (Italy) and allies of the ruling class (Major, Clinton, Kohl, Yeltsin) or struggling to end this farce? What is violent? Reinforcing these practices by "talking" about them in a "reasonable" fashion (i.e. within the rules of the game established by the ruling class for limited reform from "within") or marking the violence of conversation and its complicity with the status quo, thereby breaking the frame that represents "dialogue" as participation-when in fact it is merely a formal strategy for legitimating the established order? Any society in which the labor of many is the source of wealth for the few—all class societies are societies of violence, and no amount of "talking" is going to challenge that objective fact. "Dialogue" and "conversation" are aimed at arriving at a consensus by which this violence is made more tolerable, justifiable and naturalized.

### Link – Gratuitous Violence

#### Basing politics on the gratuitous violence of racism usurps understanding of political economy—this legitimizes neoliberal ideology and mystifies class antagonism

Reed 13 – professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, specializing in race and American politics

(Adolph, Nonsite, “Django Unchained, or, The Help: How “Cultural Politics” Is Worse Than No Politics at All, and Why”)

In both films the bogus happy endings are possible only because they characterize their respective regimes of racial hierarchy in the superficial terms of interpersonal transactions. In *The Help* segregationism’s evil was small-minded bigotry and lack of sensitivity; it was more like bad manners than oppression. In Tarantino’s vision, slavery’s definitive injustice was its **gratuitous** and sadistic brutalization and sexualized degradation. Malevolent, ludicrously arrogant whites owned slaves most conspicuously to degrade and torture them. Apart from serving a formal dinner in a plantation house—and Tarantino, the Chance the Gardener of American filmmakers (and Best Original Screenplay? Really?) seems to draw his images of plantation life from Birth of a Nation and Gone With the Wind, as well as old Warner Brothers cartoons—and the Mandingo fighters and comfort girls, Tarantino’s slaves do no actual work at all; they’re present only to be brutalized. In fact, the cavalier sadism with which owners and traders treat them belies the fact that slaves were, **first and foremost, capital investments.** It’s not for nothing that New Orleans has a monument to the estimated 20,000-30,000 antebellum Irish immigrants who died constructing the New Basin Canal; slave labor was **too valuable** for such lethal work. *The Help* trivializes Jim Crow by reducing it to its most superficial features and irrational extremes. The master-servant nexus was, and is, a labor relation. And the problem of labor relations particular to the segregationist regime wasn’t employers’ bigoted lack of respect or failure to hear the voices of the domestic servants, or even benighted refusal to recognize their equal humanity. It was that the labor relation was structured within and sustained by a political and institutional order that severely impinged on, when it didn’t altogether deny, black citizens’ avenues for pursuit of grievances and standing before the law. The crucial lynchpin of that order was neither myopia nor malevolence; it was suppression of black citizens’ capacities for direct participation in civic and political life, with racial disfranchisement and the constant threat of terror intrinsic to substantive denial of equal protection and due process before the law as its principal mechanisms. And the point of the regime wasn’t racial hatred or enforced disregard; its roots lay in the **much more prosaic concern** of dominant elites to maintain their political and economic hegemony by suppressing potential opposition and in the linked ideal of maintaining access to a labor force with no options but to accept employment on whatever terms employers offered. (Those who liked *The Help* or found it moving should watch *The Long Walk Home*, a 1990 film set in Montgomery, Alabama, around the bus boycott. I suspect that’s the film you thought you were watching when you saw The Help.) *Django Unchained* trivializes slavery by reducing it to its most barbaric and lurid excesses. Slavery also was fundamentally a labor relation. It was a form of forced labor regulated—systematized, enforced and sustained—through a political and institutional order that specified it as a civil relationship granting owners absolute control over the life, liberty, and fortunes of others defined as eligible for enslavement, including most of all control of the conditions of their labor and appropriation of its product. Historian Kenneth M. Stampp quotes a slaveholder’s succinct explanation: “‘For what purpose does the master hold the servant?’ asked an ante-bellum Southerner. ‘Is it not that by his labor, he, the master, may accumulate wealth?’”1 That absolute control permitted horrible, unthinkable brutality, to be sure, **but perpetrating such brutality was neither the point of slavery nor its essential injustice**. The master-slave relationship could, and did, exist without brutality, and certainly without sadism and sexual degradation. In Tarantino’s depiction, however, it is not clear that slavery shorn of its extremes of brutality would be objectionable. It does not diminish the historical injustice and horror of slavery to note that it was **not the product of *sui generis*, transcendent Evil but a terminus on a continuum of bound labor** that was more norm than exception in the Anglo-American world until well into the eighteenth century, if not later. As legal historian Robert Steinfeld points out, it is not so much slavery, but the emergence of the notion of free labor—as the absolute control of a worker over her person—that is the historical anomaly that needs to be explained.2 *Django Unchained* sanitizes the essential injustice of slavery by not problematizing it and by **focusing instead** on the extremes of brutality and degradation it permitted, to the extent of making some of them up, just as does *The Help* regarding Jim Crow. *The Help* could not imagine a more honest and complex view of segregationist Mississippi partly because it uses the period ultimately as a prop for human interest cliché, and *Django Unchained*’s absurdly ahistorical view of plantation slavery is only backdrop for the merger of spaghetti western and blaxploitation hero movie. Neither film is really about the period in which it is set. Film critic Manohla Dargis, reflecting a decade ago on what she saw as a growing Hollywood penchant for period films, observed that such films are typically “stripped of politics and historical fact…and instead will find meaning in appealing to seemingly timeless ideals and stirring scenes of love, valor and compassion” and that “the Hollywood professionals who embrace accuracy most enthusiastically nowadays are costume designers.”3 That observation applies to both these films, although in *Django* concern with historically accurate representation of material culture applies only to the costumes and props of the 1970s film genres Tarantino wants to recall. To make sense of how *Django Unchained* has received so much warmer a reception among black and leftoid commentators than did *The Help*, it is useful to recall Margaret Thatcher’s 1981 dictum that “economics are the method: the object is to change the soul.”4 Simply put, she and her element have won. Few observers—among opponents and boosters alike—have noted how deeply and thoroughly both films are embedded in the practical ontology of neoliberalism, the complex of unarticulated assumptions and unexamined first premises that provide its common sense, its lifeworld. Objection to *The Help* has been largely of the shooting fish in a barrel variety: complaints about the film’s paternalistic treatment of the maids, which generally have boiled down to an objection that the master-servant relation is thematized at all, as well as the standard, predictable litany of anti-racist charges about whites speaking for blacks, the film’s inattentiveness to the fact that at that time in Mississippi black people were busily engaged in liberating themselves, etc. An illustration of this tendency that conveniently refers to several other variants of it is Akiba Solomon, “Why I’m Just Saying No to ‘The Help’ and Its Historical Whitewash” in Color Lines,August 10, 2011, available at:http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/08/why\_im\_just\_saying\_no\_to\_the\_help.html. Defenses of *Django Unchained* pivot on claims about the social significance of the narrative of a black hero. One node of this argument emphasizes the need to validate a history of autonomous black agency and “resistance” as a politico-existential desideratum. It accommodates a view that stresses the importance of recognition of rebellious or militant individuals and revolts in black American history. Another centers on a notion that exposure to fictional black heroes can inculcate the sense of personal efficacy necessary to overcome the psychological effects of inequality and to facilitate upward mobility and may undermine some whites’ negative stereotypes about black people. In either register assignment of social or political importance to depictions of black heroes rests on presumptions about the nexus of mass cultural representation, social commentary, and racial justice that are more significant politically than the controversy about the film itself. In both versions, this argument casts political and **economic problems in psychological terms**. Injustice appears as a matter of disrespect and denial of due recognition, and the remedies proposed—which are all about images projected and the distribution of jobs associated with their projection—look a lot like self-esteem engineering. Moreover, nothing could indicate more strikingly the extent of neoliberal ideological hegemonythan the idea that the mass culture industry and its representational practices constitute a **meaningful terrain for struggle** to advance egalitarian interests. It is possible to entertain that view seriously only by ignoring the fact that the production and consumption of mass culture is thoroughly embedded in capitalist material and ideological imperatives. That, incidentally, is why I prefer the usage “mass culture” to describe this industry and its products and processes, although I recognize that it may seem archaic to some readers. The mass culture v. popular culture debate dates at least from the 1950s and has continued with occasional crescendos ever since.5 For two decades or more, instructively in line with the retreat of possibilities for concerted left political action outside the academy, the popular culture side of that debate has been dominant, along with its view that the products of this precinct of mass consumption capitalism are somehow capable of transcending or subverting their material identity as commodities, if not avoiding that identity altogether. Despite the dogged commitment of several generations of American Studies and cultural studies graduate students who want to valorize watching television and immersion in hip-hop or other specialty market niches centered on youth recreation and the most ephemeral fads as both intellectually avant-garde and politically “resistive,” it should be time to admit that that earnest disposition is **intellectually shallow and an ersatz politics**. The idea of “popular” culture posits a spurious autonomy and organicism that actually affirm mass industrial processes by effacing them, especially in the putatively rebel, fringe, or underground market niches that **depend on the fiction of the authentic** to announce the birth of new product cycles. The power of the hero is a cathartic trope that connects mainly with the sensibility of adolescent boys—of whatever nominal age. Tarantino has allowed as much, responding to black critics’ complaints about the violence and copious use of “nigger” by proclaiming “Even for the film’s biggest detractors, I think their children will grow up and love this movie. I think it could become a rite of passage for young black males.”6 This response stems no doubt from Tarantino’s arrogance and opportunism, and some critics have denounced it as no better than racially presumptuous. But he is hardly alone in defending the film with an assertion that it gives black youth heroes, is generically inspirational or both. Similarly, in a January 9, 2012 interview on the Daily Show, George Lucas adduced this line to promote his even more execrable race-oriented live-action cartoon, *Red Tails*, which, incidentally, trivializes segregation in the military by reducing it to a matter of bad or outmoded attitudes. The ironic effect is significant understatement of both the obstacles the Tuskegee airmen faced and their actual accomplishments by rendering them as backdrop for a blackface, slapped-together remake of *Top Gun*. (Norman Jewison’s 1984 film, *A Soldier’s Story*, adapted from Charles Fuller’s *A Soldier’s Play*, is a much more sensitive and thought-provoking rumination on the complexities of race and racism in the Jim Crow U.S. Army—an army mobilized, as my father, a veteran of the Normandy invasion, never tired of remarking sardonically, to fight the racist Nazis.) Lucas characterized his film as “patriotic, even jingoistic” and was explicit that he wanted to create a film that would feature “real heroes” and would be “inspirational for teenage boys.” Much as *Django Unchained*’s defenders compare it on those terms favorably to *Lincoln*, Lucas hyped *Red Tails* as being a genuine hero story unlike “*Glory*, where you have a lot of white officers running those guys into cannon fodder.” Of course, the film industry is sharply tilted toward the youth market, as Lucas and Tarantino are acutely aware. But Lucas, unlike Tarantino, was not being defensive in asserting his desire to inspire the young; he offered it more as a boast. As he has said often, he’d wanted for years to make a film about the Tuskegee airmen, and he reports that he always intended telling their story as a feel-good, crossover inspirational tale. Telling it that way also fits in principle (though in this instance not in practice, as *Red Tails* bombed at the box office) with the commercial imperatives of increasingly degraded mass entertainment. Dargis observed that the ahistoricism of the recent period films is influenced by market imperatives in a global film industry. The more a film is tied to historically specific contexts, the more difficult it is to sell elsewhere. That logic selects for special effects-driven products as well as standardized, decontextualized and simplistic—“universal”—story lines, preferably set in fantasy worlds of the filmmakers’ design. As Dargis notes, these films find their meaning in shopworn clichés puffed up as timeless verities, including uplifting and inspirational messages for youth. But something else underlies the stress on inspiration in the black-interest films, which shows up in critical discussion of them as well. All these films—*The Help, Red Tails, Django Unchained*, even *Lincoln* and *Glory*—make a claim to public attention based partly on their social significance beyond entertainment or art, and they do so because they engage with significant moments in the history of the nexus of race and politics in the United States. There would not be so much discussion and debate and no Golden Globe, NAACP Image, or Academy Award nominations for *The Help*, *Red Tails*, or *Django Unchained* if those films weren’t defined partly by thematizing that nexus of race and politics in some way. The pretensions to social significance that fit these films into their particular market niche don’t conflict with the mass-market film industry’s imperative of infantilization because those pretensions are only part of the show; they are little more than empty bromides, product differentiation in the patter of “seemingly timeless ideals” which the mass entertainment industry constantly recycles. (Andrew O’Hehir observes as much about *Django Unchained*, which he describes as “a three-hour trailer for a movie that never happens.”7) That comes through in the defense of these films, in the face of evidence of their failings, that, after all, they are “just entertainment.” Their substantive content is ideological; it is their contribution to the naturalization of neoliberalism’s ontology as they propagandize its universalization across spatial, temporal, and social contexts. Purportedly in the interest of popular education cum entertainment, *Django Unchained* and *The Help*, and *Red Tails* for that matter, read the sensibilities of the present into the past by divesting the latter of its specific historicity. They reinforce the sense of the past as generic old-timey times distinguishable from the present by superficial inadequacies—outmoded fashion, technology, commodities and ideas—since overcome. In *The Help* Hilly’s obsession with her pet project marks segregation’s petty apartheid as irrational in part because of the expense rigorously enforcing it would require; the breadwinning husbands express their frustration with it as financially impractical. Hilly is a mean-spirited, narrow-minded person whose rigid and tone-deaf commitment to segregationist consistency not only reflects her limitations of character but also is economically unsound, a fact that further defines her, and the cartoon version of Jim Crow she represents, as irrational. The deeper message of these films, insofar as they deny the integrity of the past, is that there is **no thinkable alternative to the ideological order under which we live**. This message is reproduced throughout the mass entertainment industry; it shapes the normative reality even of the fantasy worlds that masquerade as escapism. Even among those who laud the supposedly cathartic effects of Django’s insurgent violence as reflecting a greater truth of abolition than passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, few commentators notice that he and Broomhilda attained their freedom through a market transaction.8 This reflects an ideological hegemony in which students all too commonly wonder why planters would deny slaves or sharecroppers education because education would have made them more productive as workers. And, tellingly, in a glowing rumination in the Daily Kos, Ryan Brooke inadvertently thrusts mass culture’s destruction of historicity into bold relief by declaiming on “the segregated society presented” in *Django Unchained* and babbling on—with the absurdly ill-informed and pontifical self-righteousness that the blogosphere enables—about our need to take “responsibility for preserving racial divides” if we are “to put segregation in the past and fully fulfill Dr. King’s dream.”9 It’s all an indistinguishable mush of bad stuff about racial injustice in the old-timey days. Decoupled from its moorings in a historically specific political economy, slavery becomes at bottom a problem of race relations, and, as historian Michael R. West argues forcefully, “race relations” emerged as and has remained a discourse that substitutes etiquette for equality.10 This is the context in which we should take account of what “inspiring the young” means as a justification for those films. In part, the claim to inspire is a simple platitude, more filler than substance. It is, as I’ve already noted, both an excuse for films that are cartoons made for an infantilized, generic market and an assertion of a claim to a particular niche within that market. More insidiously, though, the ease with which “inspiration of youth” rolls out in this context resonates with three related and disturbing themes: 1) underclass ideology’s narratives—now all Americans’ common sense—that link poverty and inequality most crucially to (racialized) cultural inadequacy and psychological damage; 2) the belief that racial inequality stems from prejudice, bad ideas and ignorance, and 3) the cognate of both: the neoliberal rendering of social justice as equality of opportunity, with an aspiration of creating “competitive individual minority agents who might stand **a better fighting chance in the neoliberal rat race rather than a positive alternative vision of a society that eliminates the need to fight constantly against disruptive market whims** in the first place.”11 This politics seeps through in the chatter about *Django Unchained* in particular. Erin Aubry Kaplan, in the Los Angeles Times article in which Tarantino asserts his appeal to youth, remarks that the “most disturbing detail [about slavery] is the emotional violence and degradation directed at blacks that effectively keeps them at the bottom of the social order, a place they still occupy today.” Writing on the Institute of the Black World blog, one Dr. Kwa David Whitaker, a 1960s-style cultural nationalist, declaims on Django’s testament to the sources of degradation and “unending servitude [that] has rendered [black Americans] almost incapable of making sound evaluations of our current situations or the kind of steps we must take to improve our condition.”12 In its blindness to political economy, this notion of black cultural or psychological damage as either a legacy of slavery or of more indirect recent origin—e.g., urban migration, crack epidemic, matriarchy, babies making babies—comports well with the reduction of slavery and Jim Crow to interpersonal dynamics and bad attitudes. It **substitutes a “politics of recognition”** and a patter of racial uplift for politics and underwrites a conflation of political action and therapy. With respect to the nexus of race and inequality, this discourse supports victim-blaming programs of personal rehabilitation and self-esteem engineering—inspiration—as easily as it does multiculturalist respect for difference, which, by the way, also feeds back to self-esteem engineering and inspiration as nodes within a larger political economy of race relations**.** Either way, this is a discourse that **displaces a politics** **challenging social structures that reproduce inequality** with concern for the feelings and characteristics of individuals and of categories of population statistics reified as singular groups that are equivalent to individuals. This discourse has made it possible (again, but more sanctimoniously this time) to characterize destruction of low-income housing as an uplift strategy for poor people; curtailment of access to public education as “choice”; being cut adrift from essential social wage protections as “empowerment”; and individual material success as socially important role modeling**.** Neoliberalism’s triumph is affirmed with unselfconscious clarity in the ostensibly leftist defenses of *Django Unchained* that center on the theme of slaves’ having liberated themselves. Trotskyists, would-be anarchists, and psychobabbling identitarians have their respective sectarian garnishes: Trotskyists see everywhere the bugbear of “bureaucratism” and mystify “self-activity;” anarchists similarly fetishize direct action and voluntarism and oppose large-scale public institutions on principle, and identitarians romanticize essentialist notions of organic, folkish authenticity under constant threat from institutions. However, **all are indistinguishable from the nominally libertarian right in their disdain for government and institutionally based political action, which their common reflex is to disparage as inauthentic or corrupt.**

### AT: Perm

#### Reducing class to a neutral level among a laundry list of other oppressions eviscerates the unique potential of class analysis to resolve oppression. Class must be foregrounded – intersectionality placing patriarchy on an equal plane precludes the fundamental nature of class relations as the primary power relation deterministic of all other sources of oppression – the combination waters down the alt and makes it entirely ineffectual.

Gimenez 1 (Prof. Sociology at UC Boulder) [Martha, “Marxism and Class; Gender and Race”, Race, Gender and Class, Vol. 8, p. online: http://www.colorado.edu/Sociology/gimenez/work/cgr.html]

**There are many competing theories of race, gender, class**, American society, political economy, power, etc. **but no specific theory is invoked to define how the terms race, gender and class are used, or to identify how they are related to the rest of the social system**. To some extent, race, gender and class and their intersections and interlockings have become a mantra to be invoked in any and all theoretical contexts, for a tacit agreement about their ubiquitousness and meaning seems to have developed among RGC studies advocates, so that all that remains to be dome is empirically to document their intersections everywhere, for everything that happens is, by definition, raced, classed, and gendered. **This pragmatic acceptance of race, gender and class, as givens, results in the downplaying of theory, and the resort to experience as the source of knowledge. The emphasis on experience in the construction of knowledge is intended as a corrective to theories that, presumably, reflect only the experience of the powerful**. RGC seems to offer a subjectivist understanding of theory as simply a reflection of the experience and consciousness of the individual theorist, rather than as a body of propositions which is collectively and systematically produced under historically specific conditions of possibility which grant them historical validity for as long as those conditions prevail. Instead, knowledge and theory are pragmatically conceived as the products or reflection of experience and, as such, unavoidably partial, so that greater accuracy and relative completeness can be approximated only through gathering the experiential accounts of all groups. Such is the importance given to the role of experience in the production of knowledge that in the eight page introduction to the first section of an RGC anthology, the word experience is repeated thirty six times (Andersen and Collins, 1995: 1-9). I agree with the importance of learning from the experience of all groups, especially those who have been silenced by oppression and exclusion and by the effects of ideologies that mystify their actual conditions of existence. To learn how people describe their understanding of their lives is very illuminating, for "ideas are the conscious expression -- real or illusory -- of (our) actual relations and activities" (Marx, 1994: 111), because "social existence determines consciousness" (Marx, 1994: 211). Given that our existence is shaped by the capitalist mode of production, experience, to be fully understood in its broader social and political implications, has to be situated in the context of the capitalist forces and relations that produce it. **Experience in itself, however, is suspect because, dialectically, it is a unity of opposites; it is, at the same time, unique, personal, insightful and revealing and, at the same time, thoroughly social, partial, mystifying, itself the product of historical forces about which individuals may know little or nothing about** (for a critical assessment of experience as a source of knowledge see Sherry Gorelick, "Contradictions of feminist methodology," in Chow, Wilkinson, and Baca Zinn, 1996; applicable to the role of experience in contemporary RGC and feminist research is Jacoby's critique of the 1960s politics of subjectivity: Jacoby, 1973: 37- 49). Given the emancipatory goals of the RGC perspective, **it is through the analytical tools of Marxist theory that it can move forward, beyond the impasse revealed by the constant reiteration of variations on the "interlocking" metaphor. This would require, however, a) a rethinking and modification of the postulated relationships between race, class and gender, and b) a reconsideration of the notion that, because everyone is located at the intersection of these structures, all social relations and interactions are "raced," "classed," and "gendered." In the RGC perspective, race, gender and class are presented as equivalent systems of oppression with extremely negative consequences** for the oppressed. **It is also asserted that the theorization of the connections between these systems require "a working hypothesis of equivalency**" (Collins, 1997:74). Whether or not it is possible to view class as just another system of oppression depends on the theoretical framework within class is defined. If defined within the traditional sociology of stratification perspective, in terms of a gradation perspective, class refers simply to strata or population aggregates ranked on the basis of standard SES indicators (income, occupation, and education) (for an excellent discussion of the difference between gradational and relational concepts of class, see Ossowski, 1963). **Class in this non-relational, descriptive sense has no claims to being more fundamental than gender or racial oppression; it simply refers to the set of individual attributes that place individuals within an aggregate or strata arbitrarily defined by the researcher** (i.e., depending on their data and research purposes, anywhere from three or four to twelve "classes" can be identified). From the standpoint of Marxist theory, **however,** class is qualitatively different from gender and race and cannot be considered just another system of oppression. As Eagleton points out, **whereas racism and sexism are unremittingly bad, class is not entirely a "bad thing**" even though socialists would like to abolish it**. The bourgeoisie in its revolutionary stage was instrumental in ushering a new era in historical development, one which liberated the average person from the oppressions of feudalism** and put forth the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. **Today, however, it has an unquestionably negative role to play as it expands and deepens the rule of capital over the entire globe. The working class, on the other hand, is pivotally located to wage the final struggle against capital and, consequently, it is "an excellent thing"** (Eagleton, 1996: 57). **While racism and sexism have no redeeming feature, class relations are, dialectically, a unity of opposites; both a site of exploitation and, objectively, a site where the potential agents of social change are forged**. To argue that the working class is the fundamental agent of change does not entail the notion that it is the only agent of change. **The working class is of course composed of women and men who belong to different races, ethnicities, national origins, cultures, and so forth, so that gender and racial/ethnic struggles have the potential of fueling class struggles because, given the patterns of wealth ownership and income distribution** in this and all capitalist countries, **those who raise the banners of gender and racial struggles are overwhelmingly propertyless workers, technically members of the working class, people who need to work for economic survival** whether it is for a wage or a salary, for whom racism, sexism and class exploitation matter. **But this vision of a mobilized working class where gender and racial struggles are not subsumed but are nevertheless related requires a class conscious effort to link RGC studies to the Marxist analysis of historical change. In so far as the "class" in RGC remains a neutral concept, open to any and all theoretical meanings, just one oppression among others, intersectionality will not realize its revolutionary potential.** Nevertheless, **I want to argue against the notion that class should be considered equivalent to gender and race. I find the grounds for my argument not only on the crucial role class struggles play in processes of epochal change but also in the very assumptions of RGC studies** and the ethnomethodological insights put forth by West and Fenstermaker (1994). **The assumption of the simultaneity of experience (i.e., all interactions are raced, classed, gendered) together with the ambiguity inherent in the interactions themselves, so that while one person might think he or she is "doing gender," another might interpret those "doings" in terms of "doing class," highlight the basic issue** **tha**t Collins accurately identifies when she argues that **ethnomethodology ignores power relations. Power relations underlie all processes of social interaction and this is why social facts are constraining upon people. But** **the pervasiveness of power ought not to obfuscate the fact that** some power relations are more important and consequential than others. For example, the power that physical attractiveness might confer a woman in her interactions with her less attractive female supervisor or employer does not match the economic power of the latter over the former. In my view, **the flattening or erasure of the qualitative difference between class, race and gender in the RGC perspective is the foundation for the recognition that it is important to deal with "basic relations of domination and subordination" which now appear disembodied, outside class relations. In the effort to reject "class reductionism**," by postulating the equivalence between class and other forms of oppression, **the RGC perspective both negates the fundamental importance of class but it is forced to acknowledge its importance by postulating some other "basic" structures of domination.** **Class relations** -- whether we are referring to the relations between capitalist and wage workers, or to the relations between workers (salaried and waged) and their managers and supervisors, those who are placed in "contradictory class locations," (Wright, 1978) -- **are of paramount importance, for most people's economic survival is determined by them**. **Those in dominant class positions do exert power over their employees and subordinates and a crucial way in which that power is used is through their choosing the identity they impute their workers. Whatever identity workers might claim or "do," employers can, in turn, disregard their claims and "read" their "doings" differently as "raced" or "gendered" or both, rather than as "classed," thus downplaying their class location and the class nature of their grievances. To argue, then, that class is fundamental is not to "reduce" gender or racial oppression to class, but to acknowledge that** the underlying basic and "nameless" power at the root of what happens in social interactions grounded in "intersectionality" is class power.

#### **Single issue reforms are easily coopted and marginalized by the larger controlling structures of capital – labor is the only issue that capital cannot integrate and pacify – our universal methodology is the only way to uproot the entire system.**

Meszaros 95 (Prof. Emeritus @ Sussex) [Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition p. 40)

However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. **Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements**’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) **must be considered**, therefore, **far too premature and naive. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable causes, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable** (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), **but — precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital — can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.**

#### Alt solvency means there’s no net benefit to the perm – when we win that class relations are the master key of oppression the aff’s analysis is unnecessary to resolve their impacts. It’s try or die for maintaining the purity of the alt – the slightest risk of a link in the “third way” dooms us to extinction.

**Meszaros 1** (Prof. Emeritus, Philosophy, Univ. of Sussex)  
[lstvan, Socialism or Barbarism: From the American Century to the Crossroads, p. 37-38]

**Those who talk about** the ‘third way” as the solution to our dilemma, asserting that there can be no room for the revival of a radical mass movement, **either want to deceive us by cynically calling their** slavish **acceptance of the ruling order “the third way,’ or fail to realize the gravity of the situation,** putting their faith in a wishfully non-conflictual positive outcome that has been promised for nearly a century but never approximated even by one inch. The uncomfortable truth of the matter is that if there is no future for a radical mass movement in our time, there can be no future for humanity itself. If I had to modify Rosa Luxemburg’s dramatic words, in relation to the dangers we now face, **I would add to ‘socialism or barbarism” this qualification: “barbarism** if we are lucky**.” For the extermination of humanity is the ultimate concomitant of capital’s destructive course of development. And the world of that third possibility, beyond the alternatives of “socialism or barbarism,” would be fit only for cockroaches**, which are said to be able to endure lethally high levels of nuclear radiation.

### Root Cause

#### Capitalism is the root cause of racism – slavery born out of economic necessity was the starting point for racial oppression as a way to divide laborers.

**Taylor 2** (Alex Taylor, the Socialist Worker, http://socialistworker.org/2002-2/431/431\_08\_Racism.shtml, dashes in original)

FOR MANY people coming to radical politics--Blacks and whites alike--hatred of racism and a desire to get rid of it is a huge motivating factor. This is in contrast to some of the common assumptions about where racism comes from. The first is that racism is part of human nature--that it's always existed and always will. The second is **the** liberal **idea** of **racism**--that it **comes from** people's **bad ideas**, and that if we could change these ideas, we could get rid of it. Both assumptions **are** **wrong. Racism** isn't just an ideology but is an institution. And its origins don't lie in bad ideas or in human nature. Rather, racism **originated with capitalism and the slave trade**. As the Marxist writer CLR James put it, "The conception of dividing people by race begins with the slave trade. This thing was so shocking, so opposed to all the conceptions of society which religion and philosophers had…that the only justification by which humanity could face it was to divide people into races and decide that the Africans were an inferior race." History proves this point. **Prior to** the advent of **capitalism, racism as a systematic form of oppression** **did not exist.** For example, **ancient Greek and Roman societies had no concept of race** or racial oppression. **These weren't liberated societies. They were built on the backs of slaves.** And these societies created an ideology to justify slavery. As the Greek philosopher Aristotle put it in his book Politics, "Some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that for these latter, slavery is both expedient and right." However, because slavery in ancient Greece and Rome was not racially based, these societies had no corresponding ideology of racial inferiority or oppression. **In fact, Egyptian, Greek, Roman and Early Christian societies had a favorable image of Blacks** and of African societies. Septemus Severenus, **an emperor of Rome, was African and almost certainly Black.** "The ancients did accept the institution of slavery as a fact of life; they made ethnocentric judgments of other societies; they had narcissistic canons of physical beauty," writes Howard University professor Frank Snowden in his book Before Color Prejudice. "Yet nothing comparable to the virulent color prejudice of modern time existed in the ancient world. This is the view of most scholars who have examined the evidence." - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - RACISM ORIGINATED with the modern slave trade. Just as the slaveholders of ancient Greece and Rome created an ideology that their barbaric slave system was "natural," so did the modern slave-owning class. There was one important difference. According to them, slavery was "natural" because of race. Africans were not human beings, and therefore, they were born to be slaves. As historian Eric Williams writes in his book Capitalism and Slavery, "Slavery was not born of racism; rather, racism was the consequence of slavery." Again, history bears this out. If racism had existed prior to the slave trade, then Africans would have been the first group of people to be enslaved. But, in the early years of colonial America, slavery was not racially based. Initially, the colonists attempted to enslave Native Americans. They also imported thousands of white indentured servants. White servants were treated like slaves. They were bought, sold, put up as stakes in card games and raped, beaten and killed with impunity. Not only was **servitude a multiracial institution in** the **early** years of **colonial America, there was also a surprising degree of equality between Blacks and whites**. For example, **in 17th century Virginia, Blacks were able to file lawsuits, testify in court against whites, bear arms and own property, including servants and slaves.** In other words, 17th century Blacks in Virginia had more rights than Blacks in the Jim Crow South during the 20th century. Colonial records from 17th century Virginia reveal that one African slave named Frances Payne bought his freedom by earning enough money to buy three white servants to replace him. Such events prove the point that institutional racism did not exist in the early years of slavery--but was created later. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - OVER TIME, the slaveholding class gradually came to the conclusion that racism was in its interest and that it must be deeply embedded in all of society's institutions. There were several reasons for this conclusion. First, indentured servitude was no longer sufficient to meet the demand for labor as industry developed in Britain and put new demands on the colonial economy. Also, by the middle of the 17th century, African slaves began to live longer than five to seven years--the standard period for indentured servitude. Put in the cold terms of economic reality, slavery became more profitable than indentured servitude. Finally, Africans, whose children could also be enslaved, were more easily segregated and oppressed than servants or Native Americans. As Williams summarized this process: "Here then, is the origin of Negro slavery. The reason was economic, not racial; it had to do not with the color of the laborer, but the cheapness of the labor…This was not a theory, it was a practical conclusion deduced from the personal experience of the planter. He would have gone to the moon, if necessary, for labor. Africa was nearer than the moon." - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - BUT THE most important reason that the planter class created a racially based slave system was not economic, but political--the age-old strategy of divide and rule. The "slaveocracy" was a tiny, extremely wealthy minority surrounded by thousands of people whom it had enslaved, exploited or conquered. Its greatest fear was that slaves and servants would unite against it--and this fear was legitimate. For example, Bacon's Rebellion of 1676 began as a protest against Virginia's policy against native Americans, but turned into an armed multiracial rebellion against the ruling elite. An army of several hundred farmers, servants and slaves demanding freedom and the lifting of taxes sacked Jamestown and forced the governor of Virginia to flee. One thousand soldiers were sent from England to put it down. The rebel army held out for eight months before it was defeated. Bacon's Rebellion was a turning point. It made clear to the planters that for their class to survive, they would have to divide the people that they ruled--on the basis of race. Abolitionist and ex-slave Frederick Douglass put it this way: "**The slaveholders**…by **encourag**ing the **enmity of the poor**, laboring **white man against the** **Blacks, succeeded** in making the said white man almost as much a slave as the Black himself…Both are plundered, and by the same plunderers." Or, as Douglass also said, "They divided both to conquer each. **Over time, the institution of racism became firmly established**--both as a means of legitimizing slavery, but also **as a means of dividing poor people against one other**. While the Civil War smashed the planters' slave system, it did not end the institution of racism. The reason for this is that racism had further uses for capitalism. Similar to the slave societies of antiquity and of the early U.S., under capitalism today, a small, wealthy minority exploits and oppresses the immense majority of people. Racism is the main division among workers today, and it provides a convenient scapegoat for problems created by the system. But ordinary people--regardless of their race--don't benefit from racism. It's no coincidence that the historical periods in which workers as a whole have made the greatest gains--such as the 1930s and the 1960s--have coincided with great battles against racism. Capitalism created racism and can't function without it.The way to end racism once and for all is to win a socialist society--in which the first priority is abolishing all traces of exploitation and racism.

### Alt – Materialism

#### Our alternative is to engage in a radical socialist reimagination of politics by adopting a historical materialist perspective.

Lukacs 67 (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

Historical materialism has, therefore, a much greater value for the proletariat than that of a method of historical research. It is one of the most important of all its weapons. For the class struggle of the proletariat signifies at the same time the awakening of its class consciousness. And this awakening followed everywhere from an understanding of the true situation, of the actually existing historical connections. And it is this that gives the class struggle of the proletariat its special place among other class struggles, namely that it obtains its sharpest weapon from the hand of true science, from its clear insight into reality. Whereas in the class struggles of the past the most varied ideologies, religious, moral and other forms of 'false consciousness' were decisive, in the case of the class struggle of the proletariat, the war for the liberation of the last oppressed class, the revelation of the unvarnished truth became both a war-cry and the most potent weapon. By laying bare the springs of the historical process historical materialism became, in consequence of the class situation of the proletariat, an instrument of war. The most important function of historical materialism is to deliver a precise judgement on the capitalist social system, to unmask capitalist society. Throughout the class struggle of the proletariat, therefore, historical materialism has constantly been used at every point, where, by means of all sorts of ideological frills, the bourgeoisie had concealed the true situation, the state of the class struggle; it has been used to focus the cold rays of science upon these veils and to show how false and misleading they were and how far they were in conflict with the truth. For this reason the chief function of historical materialism did not lie in the elucidation of pure scientific knowledge, but in the field of action. Historical materialism did not exist for its own sake, it existed so that the proletariat could understand a situation and so that, armed with this knowledge, it could act accordingly.

**Historical materialism is the best methodological approach to fighting capitalism-it provides the ideological backdrop necessary to turn theory into praxis and end capitalist exploitation**

Lukacs 67 (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

**Historical materialism has**, therefore, **a much greater value** for the proletariat **than** that of a method of **historical research**. **It is one of the most important of all its weapons**. For **the class struggle** of the proletariat **signifies** at the same time **the awakening of** its **class consciousness**. **And this awakening followed everywhere from an understanding of the true situation**, of the actually existing historical connections. And **it is this that gives the class struggle** of the proletariat **its special place** among other class struggles, **namely that it obtains its sharpest weapon from** the hand of true science, from its **clear insight into reality**. **Whereas in the class struggles of the past the most varied ideologies**, religious, moral and other forms of 'false consciousness' **were decisive, in the case of the class struggle of the proletariat, the war for the liberation of the last oppressed class, the revelation of the unvarnished truth became both a war-cry and the most potent weapon**. **By laying bare** the springs of **the historical process historical materialism became**, in consequence of the class situation of the proletariat, **an instrument of war**. **The most important function of historical materialism is to deliver a precise judgement on the capitalist social system, to unmask capitalist society**. Throughout the class struggle of the proletariat, therefore, **historical materialism** has constantly been used at every point, where, by means of all sorts of ideological frills, the bourgeoisie had concealed the true situation, the state of the class struggle; it **has been used to focus the cold rays of science upon these veils and to show how false and misleading they were and how far they were in conflict with the truth. For this reason the chief function of historical materialism did not lie in the elucidation of pure scientific knowledge, but in the field of action**. **Historical materialism did not exist for its own sake, it existed so that the proletariat could understand a situation and so that, armed with this knowledge, it could act accordingly.** <224-225>

# Affirmative

## Impact Turns

### AT: War

#### Capitalism is the biggest force for peace

Gartzke, 05,(Eric, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of San Diego, 2005, Cato Institute, “Future Depends on Capitalizing on Capitalist Peace,<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/future-depends-capitalizing-capitalist-peace>, TKH)

A more powerful explanation is emerging from newer, and older, empirical research - the “capitalist peace.” As predicted by Montesquieu, Adam Smith, Norman Angell and others, nations with high levels of economic freedom not only fight each other less, they go to war less often, period. Economic freedom is a measure of the depth of free market institutions or, put another way, of capitalism.¶ The “democratic peace” is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom. Democracy and economic freedom typically co-exist. Thus, if economic freedom causes peace, then statistically democracy will also appear to cause peace.¶ When democracy and economic freedom are both included in a statistical model, the results reveal that economic freedom is considerably more potent in encouraging peace than democracy, 50 times more potent, in fact, according to my own research. Economic freedom is highly statistically significant (at the one-per-cent level). Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels.¶ But, why would free markets cause peace? Capitalism is not only an immense generator of prosperity; it is also a revolutionary source of economic, social and political change. Wealth no longer arises primarily through land or control of natural resources.¶.

### AT: Inequality

#### Neoliberal globalization solves poverty and global inequality

Martell, 10, (Luke, 2010, Professor of Political Sociology, Sussex Centre for Migration Research, “Sociology of Globalization,” TKH)

Globalisation for the poor countries of the world often means their integration into world ¶ trade and the exchange of commodities and services in the global economy. It is argued ¶ that this will allow them to trade their way out of poverty. In a situation of open ¶ competition rather than protectionism they can sell goods and services to bring in income ¶ and overcome poverty. The liberalisation of trade restricts other countries from protecting ¶ their own industries with tariffs or quotas on imports, or subsidies which give them an ¶ advantage over others. If such forms of protection are removed then the poor can trade ¶ freely without being blocked or disadvantaged and this can help them out of poverty. ¶ They also have to bring down tariffs, quotas and subsidies themselves as part of the deal. ¶ ¶ One way in which poorer countries have become integrated into world trade has been on ¶ the basis of what is sometimes called the Washington Consensus pursued through ¶ organisations such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. This refers to an ¶ approach where such organisations or richer states provide financial support to poorer ¶ countries to deal with crises or stimulate development, in return for those countries ¶ meeting certain conditions – hence that it is sometimes called ‘conditionality’. The IMF ¶ have called this ‘structural adjustment’ because countries are required to make structural ¶ changes to their economy or public sector as a condition for receiving the financial help.

### AT: Racism

#### **Free Market economics did not cause racism because profit trumps racism in capitalism.**

Camhi, 14. http://stanfordreview.org/article/white-privilege-made-in-the-usa/

Free markets did not cause white privilege in America. To understand why, we must turn to a fundamental economic fact: in a competitive market, workers are paid according to the additional value they bring to a firm. In other words, they are paid based on productivity. Better workers lead to higher profits, and any hiring decisions that are not based on productivity impair profit. Nobel Prize winning economist Gary Becker popularized the economic rationale against racial discrimination. If employers decide not to hire a productive Black worker, then they will lose out to firms that do not discriminate and can therefore capture the economic benefits of productive workers. Becker pointed out that the profit motive would usually trump racism in a free market. A recent Forbes article by Tim Worstall provides a modern example of this phenomenon: Donald Sterling. The Clippers owner is a blatant racist, yet his team is composed of mostly Black players. Sterling recognized that, if he only hired white players, he would forgo productive Black players and other allow non-discriminatory teams to outperform the Clippers. Free markets only discriminate on the basis of productivity, because any other strategy loses potential profits. Another force besides the market established a system of white advantage and simultaneously hampered Black productivity. We will see in the next section that this force was government.

### AT: Sexism

#### Capitalism is the best option to secure women’s rights.

Cudd, Ph D form Pittsburgh, Works as a Professor of Distinguished Studies at Kansas University, ’11 (Ann March 8 2011, Capitalism,” For and Against: An Introduction to a Feminist Debate”, <http://www.cambridgeblog.org/2011/03/5047/>, AGS)

A woman born in the late seventeenth century in Europe had a life expectancy of less than thirty years. She would have expected to bear seven children, and spend her days gathering wood and water, spinning yarn and making clothing, preparing food, and tending children. If she were born to a wealthy, aristocratic family she would have served mainly as a pawn in a diplomatic game between aristocratic families run by men and serving the interests of the oldest and most dominant among them. She did not look forward to any sort of political voice let alone power of her own unless she were one of the small handful of queens by birth. If she were born to a peasant family, she would have been illiterate. Much of her life was spent in hard labor and dirty, cramped conditions of life. She had little control over the timing or number of children she would bear, and she would likely bury most of her children before dying herself in childbirth.¶ My maternal grandmother was born in the late nineteenth century in the upper Midwest of the United States. She bore five children, four of whom lived until maturity, and she lived to be eighty years old in good health until her final days. When she was in her thirties, the Nineteenth Amendment to the US Constitution was ratified and she became eligible to vote in federal elections, although she never lived to see a woman elected as governor or as a senator from her state. She graduated from high school and lived the hard working life of a farm wife, but her children were more educated, and her youngest daughter, my mother, was able to earn a Master’s degree and have a professional career. While my grandmother was born in an age of horse-drawn vehicles, she lived to ride in cars, watch television, and have a phone in her home.¶ Today, a girl born in Europe or North America can expect to live into her eighties. She will learn to read at an early age and grow up surrounded by ready access to information and entertainment. She will carry a phone in her pocket that she can use to communicate with virtually anyone on the planet. She will be able to choose when and whether to bear children, and the gender and sex of her intimate partners. With varying amounts of effort and good luck (depending on her race and class position at birth), she can live a professional life just like her brothers. She can participate fully in social and political life, with almost as good a chance of gaining real power as any man.¶ These massive changes in the lives of women and girls are due in large part to the development of capitalism, the now dominant economic system on the planet. Capitalism has been the incubator of ideas from technology to marketing, and morality to politics. In my contribution to this book, I will present the case for the claim that capitalism has been the main force in the advancement of women and of society more generally, and that it can continue to be a liberating force for women around the world. As convincing (or so I shall argue) as the historical case seems, though, there are reasons for skepticism about the positive value of capitalism in the contemporary world and going forward into the future. While the quality of life for women and girls in the middle and upper classes of North America and Europe is beyond question better on virtually any measure than could ever have been imagined even by my grandmother, women and girls in much of the global South live far lesser lives than their contemporaries in the global North. Capitalism also clearly creates and sustains massive inequalities in wealth around the world and within wealthy societies. Although men are also the victims of global poverty and inequality, women are far more vulnerable to these twin ills.Women are also trafficked in greater numbers than are men, and this trafficking is motivated in part by greed and enabled by the great inequalities in wealth in the world. Women, as a group, remain dominated by men in all societies, with the possible exception of the Scandinavian countries, which have reined in the workings of capitalism through significant, democratically implemented, government interventions in market and social life. These facts notwithstanding, I shall argue that women’s best opportunity for liberation from both poverty and domination by men exists in the development of an enlightened capitalism.